

REMARKS

In the June 16, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-5 and 7-15 were pending in the application and were rejected under 35 USC § 103. In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,335,729 to Nunokawa et al. (Reference B in the April 14, 2005 Office Action) and 6,529,218 to Ogawa et al. (Reference A in the June 16, 2006 Office Action) were cited. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

The discussion of Nunokawa et al. on pages 2-3 of the Office Action was substantially the same as in the October 20, 2005 Office Action, except for the use of italics and the deletion of most of the words on lines 2-6 of page 3 which compared Nunokawa et al. with the claims. Therefore, the remarks below primarily address the distinctions between the claims and the secondary reference, changed to Ogawa et al., since the October 20, 2005 Office Action.

It was acknowledged on page 3, lines 6-8 of the June 16, 2006 Office Action that Nunokawa et al. does not disclose the display information writing unit recited on the last five lines of claim 1. However, the June 16, 2006 Office Action asserted that Ogawa et al. discloses a display information writing unit like that recited in claim 1 and that it would be obvious to combine such a unit with Nunokawa et al. The independent claims have been amended to include a feature described in, e.g., the first paragraph on page 10 of the application. As discussed below, no such feature is taught or suggested by the combination of Nunokawa et al. and Ogawa et al.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the display information writing unit writes "display information for indicating a display state, including a displayed position and magnification, of a currently displayed image" (claim 1, lines 9-10). The only information stored for a currently displayed image that has been cited or found in Ogawa et al. is "the positional coordinates of map information" (column 5, lines 10-11). Considering the acknowledgement that Nunokawa et al. does not disclose any "writing [of] display information for indicating a display state" (Office Action, page 3, lines 6-7), the combination of Nunokawa et al. and Ogawa et al. lack any suggestion that the magnification of a currently displayed image is stored.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claim 1 and independent claims 11-15 have been amended to recite "writing display information for indicating a display state, including a display position and magnification" (except that claim 15 does not include the word "for"). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1-5 and 7-15 patentably distinguish over the prior art for the reasons discussed above.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-5 and 7-15 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 18, 2006

By: *Richard A. Gollhofer*
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501